DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 424 291 TM 029 174

AUTHOR Johnson, Lewis R.
TITLE Program Evaluation in Special Education: An Examination of the Practices Utilized by Local Education Agencies.
PUB DATE 1998-00-00
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Policy; Educational Practices; *Evaluation Methods; Outcomes of Education; *Program Evaluation; *School Districts; *Self Evaluation (Groups); *Special Education; State Programs

ABSTRACT

Formal program evaluation activities in special education have focused primarily on process indicators such as compliance while neglecting product indicators such as student outcomes. While efforts are underway to provide technical assistance to state and local educational agencies to expand the focus of evaluation activities, there is a need to understand current local education agency evaluation (LEA) practices better. For this preliminary study, data from four states (New Jersey, Maine, Idaho, and Vermont) were collected to determine the extent of program self-evaluation, the sources of data, and the criteria measures used in their efforts to evaluate their special education programs. Process indicators and compliance continue to be a high priority, and student graduation and postgraduation status were not an important focus of evaluation activities. For LEAs that did not conduct self-evaluation activities, the factors that influence LEA decisions were explored. (Contains 4 tables and 24 references.) (Author/SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Running Head: PROGRAM EVALUATION IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

ED 424 291

Program Evaluation in Special Education:

An Examination of the Practices Utilized by Local Education Agencies

Lewis R. Johnson

Arkansas State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Lewis Johnson

2A

Author Note:

Lewis R. Johnson, Ed.D., Department of Special Education/Communicative Disorders.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lewis R. Johnson, Ed.D., Department of Special Education, Arkansas State University, P. O. Box 1450, State University, AR 72467. Electronic mail may be sent via Internet to: ljohnson@kiowa.astate.edu

TM029174

Abstract

Formal program evaluation activities in special education have focused primarily on process indicators such as compliance while neglecting product indicators such as student outcomes. While efforts are underway to provide technical assistance to state and local educational agencies to expand the focus of evaluation activities, there is a need to better understand current LEA program evaluation practices. For this preliminary study, data from four states were collected to determine the extent of program self evaluation, the sources of data, and the criteria measures used in their efforts to evaluate their SE programs. Process indicators and compliance continue to be a high priority, and student graduation and post-graduation status were not an important focus of evaluation activities. For LEAs which did not conduct self-evaluation áctivities the factors which influence a LEA decision were explored.

Program Evaluation in Special Education:
An Examination of the Practices Utilized by Local Education Agencies

In 1975 PL 94-142 required each State Educational Agency (SEA) to develop and implement a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of Local Educational Agency (LEA) programs in meeting the educational needs of children with disabilities (Section 1413 (a) (11)). Early writings on the topic of special education (SE) program evaluation reported efforts to evaluate state and local response to the newly enacted legislation and consequently focused on legal compliance. As one would expect, during the last twenty years of national special education legislation, the focus of program evaluation has changed.

Monitoring of Compliance

The early focus on compliance monitoring in SE program evaluation is understandable because state education agencies (SEAs) interpreted program evaluation as monitoring compliance with the legal requirements outlined in federal and state special education (SE) laws. The major provisions of the law regarding evaluation were process oriented, such as procedures to safeguard parent rights through informed consent (Borich & Nance, 1987, Field & Hill, 1985). Despite efforts in the 1980's to widen the scope of SE program evaluation activities beyond compliance to include the coordination of services and evaluation of student outcomes, as described by Borich and Nance (1987), the perception of program evaluation as being equal to program compliance persisted. According to a report published by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), 94% of the states use compliance as the predominant means of measuring program effectiveness (Gonzales, 1992). The focus on compliance continues to be justified, because many local education agencies continue to have difficulty achieving compliance (Brotski, 1986; Katsiyannis & Ward, 1992; Johnson, 1997). In efforts to improve LEA compliance, SEAs have included self-monitoring as part of overall monitoring process. However, as the demand for accountability in special education programs

and instructional practices has increased, the concept of program monitoring for effectiveness has grown beyond legal compliance (Alhern, 1995). Indeed, some LEAs have adopted policies and procedures to direct self-evaluation of their special education programs (George, George & Grosenick, 1990). Like George, George & Grosenick (1990), this study, sought to determine the current program evaluation practices utilized by LEAs, the extent to which student outcomes are used as criteria, and given the potential benefits of program evaluation to the LEA, why LEAs choose to not engage in program evaluation.

Expanding Evaluation to Include Student Outcomes

There is significant interest in outcome evaluation in special education evidenced by the work completed by the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) at the University of Minnesota and the ongoing work by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education. Reports of student outcomes have not been complimentary to special education. In 1990, the drop-out rate for students with any disability was 32.5%, and 49.5% for students with emotional/behavioral disorders (Clark & Kolstoe, 1995). Currently, outcome data are collected in terms of student exit data, such as student drop-out rate, as part of the federal/SEA reporting system. However, when there is little connection between the collection and reporting of this data to the SEA and the use of exit data as part of a local level program evaluation activities (Ysseldyke, Thurlow & Greenen, 1994).

With the recent national focus on educational reform, interest in broadening the range of program evaluation activities to include accountability in the form of student outcomes has dramatically increased (McLaughlin & Warren, 1992: Ysseldyke, Thurlow & Bruininks, 1992). In 1992 Gonzales reported that three states were in the process of collecting data on student outcomes for program evaluation purposes, with the number rising to 5 in 1994 (Alhern, 1995). Since it is recognized that there is little correlation between program compliance and program effectiveness, SEAs will need to accept the responsibility of monitoring both compliance and

program effectiveness, as expressed in outcome measures (Gonzales, 1994). As a result of this widening scope of evaluation, the program evaluation requirement should include compliance monitoring activities conducted by the SEA, and program effectiveness evaluation, utilizing student outcome measures, at the local educational agency (LEA) level through a self-evaluation process.

Outcome data include a wide variety of information. Progress towards completion of the annual individualized education program has been considered in evaluating student outcomes, however, according to McLaughlin and Warren (1992) this is not a viable means of measuring long-term student outcomes. Frequently mentioned student outcomes include: drop-out rates, graduation rates, post-school employment status, and improvements in student academic achievement (George, George & Grosenick, 1990; McLaughlin & Warren, 1992; Ysseldyke, Thurlow, & Bruininks 1992). Measures of student academic achievement and social behavior over time to identify change in achievement have been suggested numerous times as indicators of program effectiveness, as well as student attendance, self esteem, adaptive behavior, student satisfaction, and parent satisfaction, (Tindal, 1985; Borich & Nance, 1987). George, George and Grosenick (1990) reported that student progress concerns, such as attainment of student goals, were targets of program evaluation activities, but when the authors asked what criteria were used for measuring program effectiveness, outcome measures such as graduation ranked fifth out of ten and post-program employment status was ranked ninth out of ten. There is no lack of outcome indicators to use as criteria for program effectiveness evaluation; however, there seems to be little evaluation activity using these criteria.

Revisions in IDEA with respect to accountability show intent at the national level to broaden the scope of program evaluation to include student outcomes. The SEA must now include in its annual plan evidence that it has established goals for the performance of children with disabilities. The performance indicators must include performance on state and local

assessment programs, with public disclosure of group performance (300.139); drop-out rates; and graduation rates (300.137). Suspension and expulsion rates will also be compared to rates of nondisabled students to determine if discrepancies exist as part of the accountability plan (300.146). The SEA must develop a plan to improve educational and transitional results for all children with disabilities. The plan must include goals and "measurable indicators" (300.246). It is in our interest to determine to what degree these proposed student outcome measures are used as criteria in current program evaluation activities; however, this determination can not be made by investigating current SEA program evaluation criteria, it can only be accomplished by investigating LEA evaluation practices.

LEA Program Self-Evaluation

George, George and Grosenick (1990) studied LEA special education program evaluation within the context of programs for students with emotional/behavioral needs. They reported that 40% of the 145 districts surveyed conducted program evaluation activities. Other findings of their study revealed that 33% of the 145 included special education as part of the district's overall plan for evaluation. Given the potential for improving program effectiveness and gaining support from stakeholder groups, the question of why so few LEAs engage in program evaluation activities must be considered. Perhaps it is necessary to consider the nature, purposes and practices of SE program evaluation to understand this situation.

Program evaluation is a systematic and continuous process of assessing and documenting a program's progress toward its stated goals, including the assessment of students and the appraisal of the program impact (George, George & Grosenick, 1990). There are several reasons why LEAs engage in special education program evaluation. Sage and Burrello (1994) identified several purposes: program improvement, policy analysis, accountability, and public relations. It should be noted that provisions within IDEA for accountability are limited. IDEA does not require that any agency or teacher be held accountable if the student does not achieve the growth

projected in the IEP objectives. However, with a growing concern about the cost-benefit of special education and limited financial resources, LEAs should be interested in conducting evaluation activities which provide data to support their programs.

In LEAs that do not conduct program evaluation activities, there may be an unwillingness to risk learning the evaluation results in the event the results are unfavorable, such a finding could result in program changes which could jeopardize staff assignments (Worthen & Sanders, 1987). Therefore, the choice to not perform an evaluation reduces the risk of unwanted change. Ysseldyke, Thurlow & Greenen, (1994) identified several barriers to the collection of program evaluation data which could explain why an LEA would be reluctant to conduct evaluation activities. They cite mistrust in the use of the data, and fear that the information would be misused in some way. A reluctance to be held responsible for lack of educational gains may be a factor. Certainly lack of resources should be considered as a factor which influences the decision not to engage in program evaluation. Nonmandated evaluation activities require resources of time and money. A LEA may decide that the money spent on program evaluation activities would be better spent on providing direct student services (Posavac & Carey, 1985). Another reason for resistance to evaluation could be prior experiences with program evaluation, in which the information learned through the program evaluation was unused (Ysseldyke, Thurlow & Greenen, 1994), resulting in no impact to the program and a waste of resources. Finally, the LEA may have had negative experiences with external program evaluators and consequently do not consider program evaluation as a positive experience (Osborne, DiMattia & Curran, 1993).

In the event that a district wished to conduct a program evaluation, there may be reasons which prevent pursuing the evaluation activity. Worthen and Sanders (1987) cite inadequate financial resources, lack of staff cooperation, and inaccessible data as factors which thwart evaluations. Lack of personnel with the technical expertise necessary for conducting evaluation activities has been cited by Gonzales (1992) and the National Association of State Directors of

Special Education cited lack of resources, both financial and time as a obstacle to program evaluation at the SEA and LEA level (NASDSE, 1993). Finally, methodological issues, such as what data to collect and how to analyze it, may interfere with the LEA's ability to conduct program evaluation activities (Ysseldyke, Thurlow & Greenen, 1994). As we learn more about the obstacles LEAs encounter in their evaluation efforts, this information may assist LEAs in building the capacity to conduct self-evaluations of their SE programs.

Purpose

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to collect data from LEAs about their special education program evaluation procedures. The author addressed the following research questions:

1. What percentage of LEAs conducted SE self-evaluation activities, and for those LEA's which did not conduct program self-evaluation, what factors were cited as influencing the decision to not conduct an evaluation.
2. For those LEA's which conducted program self-evaluation, what type of criteria, process v. outcome, were used to measure program quality/effectiveness.
3. For those LEA's which conducted program self-evaluation, what information sources were used in measuring program quality/effectiveness.

Method

Participants

LEAs in four states were surveyed for this study, one state, New Jersey, which reportedly does not include measures of outcomes and three states, Maine, Idaho, and Vermont, which according to Alhern (1995) include measures of student outcomes as part of the SEA program review process. Additionally, all four state's SEAs reported that they include LEA self-monitoring as part of the SEA compliance monitoring process (Alhern, 1995). A mailing list for district special education administrators in each state was requested and from these lists only

administrators of single-district educational units were considered as the population of this study. This eliminated administrators of special purpose schools and multi-district cooperatives. From the mailing labels which remained, every other label was selected to form the subject group. As a result of this process, surveys were mailed in spring 1997 to 275 LEAs in New Jersey, 108 in Idaho, 60 in Vermont, and 82 in Maine. One follow-up survey mailing was completed three weeks after the initial mailing to districts which did not respond. Demographic information for each state are is presented in Table 1.

<Table 1 here>

Instrument

For the purpose of this study, program evaluation activities are those activities which are conducted to determine the effectiveness of the LEA's SE procedures or programs beyond the performance of individual student assessments. A survey instrument, the Special Education Program Evaluation Survey (SEPES) was devised for this study using items from the evaluation subsection of the Program Inventory developed for the National Needs Analysis Project: Fostering Quality Program Planning and Design in the Area of Emotional Disturbance by J. Grosenick (1985). Like the Program Inventory, the SEPES, asked respondents to use a Likert scale to indicate their perceptions of the level of importance of 1) various criteria for SE program as indicators of effectiveness, and 2) information sources used for program self evaluation activities conducted over the last three years. Other sections of the Program Inventory were revised to reflect recent program evaluation research published by the NCEO on educational accountability for students with disabilities and the requirement for transition as part of the IEP. The seven point Likert scale allowed respondents to indicate a range for each item from 0 which means "not at all important" to 7 "of major importance". For data analysis purposes, the Likert scale response (0-7) for each item was averaged across all cases and each item was ranked in order from highest to lowest, forming a hierarchical list of factors to describe

current practices in SE program self evaluation. The resulting data are presented in two groups, one representing a state which does not include outcomes measures as part of its SEA review, and the other three states which do include outcome measures as part of its SEA review. In consideration that some LEAs choose not to conduct self-evaluation, seven additional questions were added to the Program Inventory to determine which factors may have influenced the decision not to perform a program self-evaluation activity.

Results

For states surveyed, the number of responses and rates were New Jersey 122 (44%), Maine 36 (43%), Idaho 51 (47%), and Vermont 29 (48%). With regards to research question 1, seventy-three percent of the LEAs reported that they have conducted a program self-evaluation activity within the last three years. Of those 48% indicated that they had a written policy or procedure for self-evaluation, and 51% reported that their budget included an allocation for SE program evaluation activities. Of the 27% of the districts which reported that they did not conduct program self-evaluation, insufficient resources of time (mean = 3.97) was rated as the most significant factor in deciding not to conduct a self evaluation. This was followed by lack of evaluation expertise (mean = 2.99) and then insufficient financial resources (mean = 2.71). There was agreement across all states as to the top three factors identified as obstacles. Concern that resulting evaluation data would be misused (mean = 1.37) or unused (mean = 1.34) and reluctance to use an external evaluator (mean = 1.39) were the three factors which exerted the least influence on the administrator's decision not to conduct self-evaluation activities. Table 2 presents by state, the percentage of districts which did not conduct self-evaluation and the means of items from the SEPES which were identified as barriers to self-evaluation.

<Table 2 here>

For those LEA's which conducted program self-evaluation, it was unanimous, the most important criteria for measuring program quality/effectiveness was the item "attainment of

compliance with regulations" (mean = 5.79) and secondly parent satisfaction with program (mean = 5.47). Student progress in the program ranked third overall (mean = 5.47). The three items which ranked at the bottom of the list in importance as a criteria were student participation in post-graduation training (mean = 3.13), student participation in post-graduation employment (mean = 3.25), and student graduation rate (mean = 4.19). There was agreement across all states with regards to this rank order of these criteria. See Table 3 for a list of mean scores for all criteria statements.

<Table 3 here>

The third research question asked what sources of information were most important in the evaluation process. Combining all state data, interviews (mean = 5.26) were rated as major source of evaluation data, followed by direct observation (mean = 5.02) and questionnaire/survey data (mean = 5.01). Again, there was agreement across all states in the items rated as a major source of evaluation information. Using the mean of all states' means, criterion-referenced (mean = 3.15) and standardized tests (mean = 3.30) were ranked as "not major sources of information". Student discipline reports (mean = 3.33), attendance data (mean = 3.72), and exiting report data (3.74) were also in the bottom half of the rank order list. When viewing the data listed by state, as in Table 4, an exception to the pattern is noted. In New Jersey, a state which does not include outcomes measures in the SEA review, test scores were identified as more important than discipline records, attendance data, and exiting report data.

Discussion

Like the study conducted by George, George and Grosenick (1990), this study was designed to collect data to describe the status of LEA program evaluation and to determine the extent LEAs have moved beyond program compliance to a more multidimensional means of measuring program quality and effectiveness. Given the mandate to collect student outcomes data in the most recent reauthorization of IDEA, attention in this study was given to asking

questions about the presence of evaluation policies and procedures, and the use of extant data and student outcomes measures as an additional data source for program evaluation. In the document Effectiveness Indicators for Special Education: A Reference Tool (1986), an indicator of effectiveness within the program evaluation section is the presence of a policy or procedure for program self-evaluation; while another is the provision of financial resources to facilitate program evaluation activities. LEAs which are serious about program evaluation include policies and procedures for evaluation and financial resources to facilitate the activity.

In 1990, George, George and Grosenick reported that 33 percent of the responding LEAs have written policies or procedures to guide their evaluation activities. An additional 40% of the LEAs in their study reported conducting program evaluation, but had no policies or procedures to guide their efforts. Therefore, 73% of the LEAs responding conducted some form of program evaluation. Now seven years later in response to the same question concerning program evaluation, 73% reported that the LEA had conducted a program self-evaluation activity, 48% of the LEAs reported having written policies or procedures for program evaluation, and 51% of the LEAs have funds budgeted for program evaluation. While the percentage of LEAs conducting evaluation activities remained the same, more districts had written policies or procedures which is a required section of the LEAs annual program plan.

Sixty-four (27%) of the LEAs reported no special education program self-evaluation activity. From this group, 16 (25%) LEA administrators indicated no need to conduct program self evaluations because their programs were evaluated by the state department of education. It is encouraging that this perspective is not shared by the other special education administrators in this group. Instead, the explanations they offered for not completing a program evaluation were all related to resources with insufficient time at the top of the list. This finding is not surprising given the demands and time consuming tasks with which administrators must cope, leaving little room for "nonmandated" professional activities. The finding that resources may be a significant

influence on program evaluation decisions is consistent with comments made in the 1993 NASDSE report . Ysseldyke, Thurlow and Greenen (1994) suggested mistrust of how the evaluation data would be used or that the data would not be used were reasons for not collecting evaluation data. It is noteworthy that in this study, these reasons were ranked at the bottom of the list of 7 factors identified as barriers to program evaluation. Clearly, attention must be given to building a local educational agency's capacity to conduct program self-evaluations. Presently, LEAs collect a wide variety of data. Disciplinary records, attendance statistics, student follow up surveys, and IEP information are just a few of the pieces of extant data available for LEAs to examine. However, LEAs do not have a means of systematically compiling and interpreting the data (Levesque, Bradby & Rossi, 1996; Ysseldyke, Thurlow & Greenen, 1994).

If the goal of a SE program is to provide appropriate educational opportunities which improve a student's educational experiences while attending school through implementation of a legally compliant process while maintaining a high level of parent satisfaction with the program, then the LEAs represented in this study are using the appropriate evaluation criteria. This goal is process oriented, rather than student outcomes oriented. If the goal of special education is to prepare students to lead a productive adult life, we as special educators are engaging in an appropriate dialogue, but not in appropriate evaluation practice. Student Outcome indicators were rated relatively low in importance as indicators of program quality/effectiveness. For example, student graduation (mean = 4.19), student post graduation employment status (mean = 3.25), and student placement in post graduation training (mean = 3.13) when compared to attainment of compliance (mean = 5.79) reflects a focus of LEAs on process, rather than outcome. Evaluation of special education programs must focus on both process and outcomes. There must be a balance in the evaluation system between compliance, quality of services, and student outcomes as advocated by Borich and Nance (1987).

The sources of information which the LEAs in this study reported as most important

sources of data reflect the process focus of their evaluation activities. Subjective sources of information: interviews, observation, and surveys claimed the top three positions on the list of data collection methods while the bottom four items are objective sources of information. Outcome assessment has historically been accomplished through survey methodology, so there is consistency between the findings of this study and past evaluation practice (Scriven, 1991). Generally, objective data, such as attendance, discipline records, and test scores, are easily collected and compared to those of students without disabilities and across years to determine trends and to establish benchmarks for further program development and improvement. An examination of the New Jersey data reflects little variability in the relative importance of various sources of information used for evaluation activities. The highest rated source was interviews (mean = 4.80) and the lowest was student discipline records (mean = 3.43) on a seven point scale. One interesting finding is the low ranking of criterion-referenced tests which is a means of assessing students based on a student's IEP program. This was ranked at the bottom of the list, in three of the four states. Perhaps, this source of evaluation data will rank higher in subsequent surveys after the new assessment requirements are implemented, but only if the LEAs have some means of collecting and interpreting the data. The work of Management Planning Research Associates should prove helpful in easing LEAs into the evaluation process. They are producing a step-by-step handbook for establishing a performance indicator system which will use available data, including student outcomes (Levesque, Bradby & Rossi, 1996).

Implications

This study was intended to determine the status of program evaluation as special education evaluation expands to include student outcomes in addition to compliance. Using an instrument which was modeled after one used ten years ago by George, George, and Grosenick (1990) permitted some comparison of the recent data collected for this study and data from ten years ago. The findings of both studies are similar, especially with respect to the lack of focus on

student outcomes. The good news is that there is much discussion of student outcomes. The bad news is that according to this preliminary study, compliance is still an evaluation priority for special education programs at the LEA level. Based on this finding, research efforts must continue to study LEA determinants of program compliance to assist LEAs in attaining and maintaining compliance. If compliance is more easily attained, LEA administrators will be able to focus on program quality and effectiveness in terms of outcomes. Additional recommendations include:

1. State educational agencies will need to provide training and technical assistance in the best ways to collect and use data for program improvement as part of the mandated system of accountability.

2. Staff development at the LEA level is needed to reduce the apprehension of evaluation, build an understanding of accountability systems, and gain stakeholder consensus of what data to collect (Ysseldyke, Thurlow & Greenen, 1994).

3. LEAs should make use of annually collected extant data (Ysseldyke, Thurlow & Greenen, 1994) which is collected and reported to the SEA by recording this data into a database "expert system" which would permit analysis with only an initial investment of time.

4. LEAs in developing assessment procedures and instruments to collect student outcomes to comply with IDEA, should systematically enter this data into the IEP and maintain records electronically to permit summary reports and analysis.

References

Alhern, E. M. (1995). State compliance monitoring practices: An update. (Project FORUM, Final Report Year 3, Contract #HS92015001) Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

Borich, G. D., & Nance, D. D. (1987). Evaluating special education programs: shifting the professional mandate from process to outcome. Remedial and Special Education, 8(3), 7-16.

Brotski, D. E. (1986). Compliance with educational legislation for handicapped children in the state of Wisconsin. Dissertation abstracts International, 48(01), 13A. (University Microfilms No. 8702288)

Clark, G. M., & Kolstoe, O. P. (1995). Career development & transition education for adolescents with disabilities. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Field, S. L., & Hill, D. S. (1985). Contextual appraisal: A framework for meaningful evaluation of special education programs. Remedial and Special Education, 9(4), 22-43.

George, M. P., George, N. L., & Grosenick, J. K. (1990). Features of program evaluation in special education. Remedial and Special Education, 11(5), 23-30.

Gonzales, P. (1992). State procedures for the evaluation of special education program effectiveness. (Project FORUM, Contract #300-87-0155) Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

Gonzales, P. (1994). Effectiveness, compliance, accountability, and program improvement: perspectives on the evaluation requirement. (Project FORUM, Final Report Year 1, Contract #HS92015001) Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

Grosenick, J. K. (1985). Program Inventory. (National Needs Analysis Project) University of Oregon.

Katsiyannis, A., & Ward, T. J. (1992). Parent participation in special education: compliance issues as reported by parent surveys and state compliance reports. Remedial and Special Education, 13(5), 50-62.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997. Title 1, U.S.C. 1400.

Johnson, L., & Walker, D. (1997). The relationship between local education agency special education program characteristics and program compliance. National FORUM of special Education Journal, 6 (1-2), 33-44.

Levesque, K., Bradby, D, & Rossi, K. (1996). Using data for program improvement: How do we encourage schools to do it? Centerfocus [On-line]: http://vocserve.berkeley.edu.CenterFocus /CF12.html

McLaughlin, M. J., & Warren, S. H. (1992). Outcome assessment for students with disabilities: Will it be accountability or continued failure? Preventing School Failure, 36(4), 29-33.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education. 1993. A forum to examine policy and practice surrounding the annual evaluation of program effectiveness. Alexandria, VA: author.

Osborne, A. G., DiMattia, P., & Curran, F. X. (1993). Effective management of special education programs: A handbook for school administrators. New York: Teachers College Press.

Posavac, E. J. & Carey, R. G. (1985). Program evaluation methods and case studies (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sage, D. D. & Burrello, L. C. (1994). Leadership in educational reform: An administrator's guide to changes in special education. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Scriven, M. (1991). Evaluation thesaurus. Newbury Park: Sage.

The National Regional Resource Centers Panel on Indicators of Effectiveness in Special Education, (1986). Effectiveness indicators for special education: A reference tool. (Eric

Document Reproduction Services ED 283 336).

Tindal, G. (1985). Investigating the effectiveness of special education: An analysis of methodology. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 18(2), 101-111.

Worthen, B. R., & Sanders, J. R. (1987). Educational evaluation: Alternate applications and practical guidelines. New York: Longman.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., & Bruininks, R. H. (1992). Expected educational outcomes for students with disabilities. Remedial and Special Education, 13(6), 19-30.

Ysseldyke, J., Thurlow, M., & Greenen, K. (1994). Educational accountability for students with disabilities. Minneapolis: MN: National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Table 1

Demographic Information for LEA Respondents (N=238)

	M	SD	Range
Number of Children ages 3-21 Enrolled in Schoools -NJ	224	186	16-952
Number of Children ages 3-21 Enrolled in Schools -ME	184	114	10-600
Number of Children ages 3-21 Enrolled in Schools -ID	161	199	10-700
Number of Children ages 3-21 Enrolled in Schools -VT	212	242	14-1250

Table 2

Means of Factors Identified As Barriers to Program Evaluation By Districts Which Did Not Conduct Special Education Evaluation Activities Listed in Rank Order

Factor Identified as a Barrier to Evaluation	NJ	VT	ME	ID	Mean	Rank
insufficient resources of time	4.75	4.69	3.38	3.07	3.97	1
lack of evaluation expertise in district	4.38	3.46	2.25	1.87	2.99	2
insufficient financial resources	3.88	3.00	2.56	1.40	2.71	3
no need for evaluation data	3.50	1.31	1.69	.80	1.83	4
reluctance to use external evaluator	2.63	1.30	1.10	.53	1.39	5
evaluation data, if gathered, will not be used	2.13	1.23	1.13	.87	1.34	6
concern that evaluation data may be misused	3.13	.77	1.31	.27	1.37	7

Table 3

A Comparison of Rank Order for Criteria Used In Measuring the Quality/effectiveness of the District's Special Education Program Separated by States Which Do/Do Not Include Outcomes as Part of the SEA Review Process

Criteria Used by District	NJ	Rank	VT	ME	ID	Mean	Rank
attainment of compliance w/ regulations	5.95	1	5.30	5.93	5.97	5.79	1
student progress in program	5.90	2	5.00	4.93	5.23	5.27	3
parent satisfaction with program	5.66	3	5.30	5.29	5.61	5.47	2
student success in regular classroom	5.84	4	5.30	4.07	5.33	5.14	4
student satisfaction with program	5.14	5	4.50	4.64	4.73	4.75	5
teacher satisfaction	5.06	6	4.40	4.50	5.01	4.74	6
student graduation rate	4.32	7	3.80	4.14	4.48	4.19	7
student in post-graduation employment	2.64	8	3.00	3.43	3.91	3.25	8
student in post-graduation training	2.62	9	2.90	3.39	3.61	3.13	9

Mean = mean of the states' mean

Table 4

A Comparison of Rank Order for Sources of Information Used by Districts in the Program Evaluation Process Separated by States Which Do/Do Not Include Outcomes as Part of the SEA Review Process

Information Source	NJ	Rank	VT	ME	ID	Mean	Rank
interviews	4.80	3	5.40	5.21	5.64	5.26	1
direct observation	5.23	1	4.80	5.00	5.03	5.02	3
questionnaire / survey	5.13	2	5.80	5.71	3.39	4.96	2
IEP gains	4.80	4	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.24	4
anecdotal records	3.81	6	4.20	3.50	4.34	3.96	5
exiting report data	3.60	9	4.10	3.50	3.76	3.74	6
attendance data	3.63	8	4.20	3.93	3.12	3.72	7
student discipline reports	3.43	10	4.10	2.93	2.85	3.29	8
standardized tests	3.80	7	3.00	3.07	3.33	3.13	9
criterion-referenced tests	3.84	5	3.10	2.50	3.15	2.92	10

NJ does not include student outcomes in the SEA review.

VT, ME, and ID include student outcomes in the SEA review.

Mean = mean of the states' mean